fShri Puttapaga Radhakrishna] that could have been amended now *itselt.* He may save since the Constitution says 21 yeans, we cannot propose amendment for 18 years straightway in the Act without having provisions in the Constitution. But he can do one thing. We need not mention any figure of 21 or 18 in the Section. We can simply save whatever is provided under Article 326 of the Constitution. If at all they are sincere to implement lt for the forthcoming elections, they could have done like this.

Hon. Member, Shri P. N. Sukul, from the other side was pleading for the right of the bureaucrats to contest elections. He called them as second grade citizens. I may point out that bureaucrats are the most privileged class of this country. They have got every right and every privilege. He is forgetting the down-trodden communities in the country who have got no facility to get themselves enrolled as voters even; they have no facility to go to the polling booths and cast their vote. Poor people are not being enrolled as voters. Nobody is taking any pains to go to the s'l™ areas. That is why I say the right to contest the elections by bureaucrats is violative of the doctrine of separation of powers also. They belong to the executive and they cannot go to the legislature without giving up the bureaucratic positions.

I wanted to speak on many points, but since you are asking me to conclude I would like to speak on the last poinl. There is a provision against booth capturing which includes prevention of voters from going to tfie polling booths also, i have gone through the Bill. That provision is there. Mr. Jethmalani has also mentioned earlier that it is already there. That protection % there under the IPC. but nobody is there to take care of it and nobody is there to protect their interests. What is the machinery to implement these provisions- i I want to know from the Government.

Lastly, there is a provision for deputation of personnel or election duties. It is not practicable. Basically the election personnel are employees of the State Government. They are not whole-timers but are part-timers on election duty. Generally in the Lok Sabha elections, Disrict Magistrates are th*e Returning Officers. They discharge the duties as District Magistrates there and do part-time election duty as Returning Officers. How can one Officer discharge two duties under different authorities simultaneously? It is not practicable and I think it would not stand the the test of law. That is why I say it is not advisable to have this provision. They are. fundamentally State Government employeeg and there will be clash of instructions if they are taken on deputation as part-timers.

With this I conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl H. .HANUMANTHAPPA): ' Discussion concluded. The Minister will reply tomorrow.

Now, Statement by the Minister, Shri Sukh Ram.

STATEMENT By MINISTER

Statutory Minimum Price for Sugarcane and Levy Sugar Price policy for 1988-89 and Statutory Minimum Price for Sugareane for 1989-90

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVlL SUPPLIES (SHRI SUKH RAM); Sir, as the Hon'ble Members are aware, the Central Government has been announcing the Statutory Minimum Price of Sugareane payable by sugar factories, in advance of sowing season. Thus the Statutory Minimum Price of sugarcane for 1988-89 season Was announced in December, 1987 at Rs. 19.00 per quintal, linked to a recovery of 8.5 per cent,

with proportionate premium for higher recoveries. The Government have now decided to raise this price co Rs. 19.50 per quintal, linked to a recovery of 8.5 per cent, keeping in view the overall interests of the growers and the industry- necessitated by the steep fall in recovery in major sugar producing zones and the general level of States advised sugarcane prices. This marks an increase of Rs. 1 per quintal.ove$_r$ the price fixed for 1987-88. The Statutory Minimum Price, it may be mentioned, is only the floor price below which no factory can pay.

Fo$_r$ the season 1989-90 the Commission for Agricultural .Costs and Prices has recommended a Statutory Minimum Price of Rs. 20.00 per quin. tal, linked to a recovery of 8.5 per cent. The Central Government has accepted this recommendation.

As a consequence of the increase in the Statutory Minimum Price of Sugareane for the 1988-89 sugar season, the retail issue price of levy sugar distributed through the public distribution system would be Rs. 5.25 per Kg. against the existing price of Rs. 5.10 per Kg. The revised price will take effect from lst January, 1989.

The ratio of levy to free-sale sugar fo$_r$ 1988-89 sugar year has been changed from 50:50 to 45:55. This ratio ha$_s$ been changed taking into consideration the requirements of th$_e$ public distribution system, the consumption trends in the open market and availability of sugar at reasonable price.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I request the Members to be brief and put only pointed questions. Shri Shanti Tyagi.

श्री शान्ति त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बधाई देता हूं मंत्री मंत्री जी को गन्ने के दाम में बढ़ोत्तरी के लिए । मैं सिर्फ दो ही बातें कहूंगा । एक, यह कि जो गन्ने के दाम बढ़े हैं, उसका एरियर भी आप देंगे ? दूसरा, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की चीनी मिलों को, नई चीनी मिलों को खोलने की नीति है, उसको क्या आप उदार बनाने की कृपा करेंगे । सिर्फ यही दो प्रश्न मैं कर रहा हूं ।

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Bihar); Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the announcement which has been made by the Minister through this statement is a total surrender to the mill sectoir. I repeat, it is a total surrender of Government policy to the mill sector. The Statutory Minimum Price of Sugareane has been raised by only 50 paise over the last year from Rs. 19.00 to Rs. 19.50. This is most un-satisfactory and anybody who is aware of the condition of the growers in the field knows how inadequate this price ls and for the Government to say that they have raised it and this i$_s$ the minimum floor price below which no mill can pay, is an argument which does not cut any ice. I am glad that other State Governments have fixed much "higher prices. Their advised price ls mucti higher than what the SMP is. But the' Central Government would have probably done, better if this price had been increased by a much larger margin than what has actually been done. I am surprised, Sir, that the Government claims credit "for having increased it on the -basis of the Commission for Agricultural Costs and prices to Rs. 20.00 per quintal linked to a recovery of 8.5 pejr cent for the 1989-90 season. Now, We would have liked to see in the statement of the Minister, the reasons given by the Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices for" recommending the Statutory Minimum Price of Sugareane,. Rs. 20.00 per quintal so that we could offer our comments on this. But this is absolutely missing.

The third point, Sir, is that in raising the price from Rs.'5.10 per Kg. to Rs..- 5.25 per Kg., the Government has surrendered to the pressure of th$_e$ Mills. There is absolutely no

[Shri Yashwant Sinha]

justification if this is the increase in the Mininmum price of cane ior the sale price of sugar to be raised.

The last point is that. in fixing the ratio *ol* levy to free-sale sugar, the Gove-nment has surrendered to the mill sector by changing it from 50 : 50 to 45 : 45. This is a total surrender. This is totally uncalled for. I am sure the Ministe'r is awarg and you are also aware that sugacane is not a crop but it is the life of the people where sugareane is grown. There every activity of life is linked to that one drop. I am just coming from that area and I know that every year the mills crush not only sugarcane but they crush the farmers and this is what they are doing every year. *I* am sorry to say that the Government has not responded well to the requirement of the sugarcane growers. They have surrendered to the mill sector. They have sold themselves to the millowners' lobby.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं सबसे पहले मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि 20 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल की कृषि लागत और मूल्य आयोग ने जो सिफारिश की है, उसका आधार क्या है ? गन्ने का उत्पादन खर्चा कितना होता है । यह कृषि मूल्य जो 20 रुपए रखा है, आज महाराष्ट्र में लगभग 30 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल से सबको मिलता है । उसमें 20 रुपए न्यूनतम रखने से तो किसानों को कोई लाभ नहीं है । यह केवल दिखावे के लिए किया गया है । इसलिए मैं इसके साथ यह मांग करना चाहता हूं कि जब तक इसे 35 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल नहीं किया जाता है यह उचित नहीं होगा । इसलिए पहले मैं कृषि मूल्य आयोग का लाजिक जानना चाहूंगा । दूसरे, मुझे यह कहना है की चीनी के दाम आपने 15 पैसे किलो बढ़ाये । सौ क्विंटल गन्ने से सौ किलो शक्कर तैयार होती है । सौ क्विंटल को आपने बढ़ाया है यहां एक रुपए के हिसाब से । लगभग एक पैसा एक किलो चीनी पर आता है । तो जब किसान को आप देते हैं तो एक पैसे के हिसाब से देते हैं और जब चीनी के दाम में वृद्धि करते हैं ग्राहक के लिए तो 15 पैसे करते हैं । इस 15 पैसे के पीछे सरकार का क्या लाजिक है । इसमें किसानों को कितना मिल रहा है और दुकानदार को कितना जा रहा है, इसका हिसाब लगाया जाए क्योंकि यह 5 रुपए 10 पैसे से 15 पैसे बनाए हैं, वह केवल किसान के कारण हुआ है या बिचौलियों के कारण हुआ है ? मंत्री जी कृपया इस संबंध में बतायें ।

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN (Kerala): Sir, the sugar coated statement of the Minister ig not going to solve any of the problems of the sugarcane growers. On the other hand, it shows that it is a clear surrender to the mill sector. Why I am telling this? When we got freedom, the sugareane producers were getting 60 per cent of the value at which sugar was sold in the market. After forty years, it has been reduced. If Rs. 100 is the price for one quintal of sugar, now, they will get only 51 per cent of the price, that is Rs. 51. That means from 60 per cent it has been reduced to 51 per cent. Why has this change come? In all these years, the mill sector has been able to gam much. There is increase in the price of the rawmaterial and othtr inputs. This must be taken into account and at the same time, the Government should take into account the infrastructure for cultivation how much it has increased, manure prices, workers' wages and the mill owners' profit, all these things have to be taken into account. Without taking all these things into accourit, if you are going to fix the prices, then it will not solve the problems of the cultivators. You have stated very clearly that the statutory minimum price is only the floor price below which the factory estnnot pay. I can understand that. But there should be some correlation. What is the correlation when you fi K the price? So the Government should take into account the position how the factories are minting profit and

now the agriculturists are suffering. Ali these things shoula be taken into account. I do not know how the APC. has fixed the price like this. So, the Government must come forward with new proposals. This is absoluately useless as far as the peasants are concerned.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, the statement made by the hon. Minister is irrelevant, unrealistic and far from reality. All the State Governments, including the Congress-ruled States, are adopting their own indicative prices or suggestive prices which are f[a]r higher than the Minimum support price announced by the Minister, more than Rs. 30j-. It is so in Maharashtra, Karnataka, Keraia and U. P. and many other States. In U.P., recently Mr. Rajesh Pilot negotiated between the farmers and the Starte Government and enhanced the price. But the price shown by the Minister is only Rs. 19.50. The difference between the indicative price and the minimum support price does not go into the calculations while fixing the levy price. Several State-owned cooperative "sugar factories as well as State-owned public sector units are paying much more. In Andhra Pradesh itself, the State-owned Nizam Sugar Factory as well as Cooperative Sugar Facto'ry are paying more than what the minimum support price is. So, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister and to the Government that this irrelevant and unrealistic price should be given up. Your price is nor being adopted by your own State Governments. So, you should be more realistic and go in for a higher price.

The second point is, as pe$_r$ the calculation the minimum support price oer quintal of sugarcane is enhanced bv 50 paise whereas +he levy sugar m-ice has heen enhanced *by* 15 paise per Kg. Therefore, as per the 8.5 oe'r cent recovery rate per quintal in the levy price, the mill owner's gets 127 saise. And the ratio between the levy price an<J the non-levy price,has been changed from 45 to 55 per cent. So, on thi$_s$ account goe$_s$ another Re. 1|-. So you offer Rs. 2.27 per quintal to the mill owner whereas 50 per cent percolates t$_0$ the grower. Therefore, I would like to advice the hon. Minister and the Government to withdraw this and se$_e$ that the price is enhanced ait least by Rs. 3.50 per quintal.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); Mr. Minister.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY Pondicherry): From ou$_r$ side nobody has spoken. *(Interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Hon. Members know the 'rules regarding statements. They have been circulated time and again. Please, sit down.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY; It depends upon....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Narayanasamy, please sit down.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: This is relating to the problems of agriculturists. I would like to speak. I will take only one minute.

SHRI YASWANT SINHA: This is a very important subject. Let two or three more people apeak.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Conventions havie been broken in this House about statements. I will take only one minute. *(Interrufttions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); I just remind hon. "Members that you are not obeying the Chair. That is point No. 1. Point No. 2, you yourselves did not want the House to sit late. Whenever it suits you, you want the, discussion to continue and whenever it does not suit you, you *do not* want the discussion to oontiflue. *Umer; ruptions).* Firet, the Chair ,announced

[Shri H. Hanumanthappa] that we could sit even till midnight. But the objection was from Members. *(Interruptions')*. No interruptions, please. Sit down. Looking to the mood of the House, 1 did it. If the House wants to sit late, I have no objection. The Chair, the Deputy Chairman, announced that the Chair was prepared to sit overnight if you wanted. *(Interruptiom),* Whenever you want, there should be amendment of the rules. Otherwise, not. Anyway, I go by the mood of the House. 1 will call everybody.

श्री सुखराम : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीहेच० हनुमनसत्पा): आप बैठिए एक मिनट के लिए i am allowing the other Members. Mr. Narayanasamy.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY; I am very happy that the Ministe'r has announced 50 paise increase on the price of sugarcane per quintal. I am surprised, however, that the price of sugareane varies from one state to another. In' Tamil Nadu it is Rs. 280 per quintal, in Karnataka it is Rs. 330, in Maharashtra it is Rs. 350. Like that it varies frcm State to State. I would like to suggest to the honourable Minister that the minimum support price which is given, if the recovery point is to remain 8.5 per cent, should be uniform; a uniform price should be paid to all the farmers. If it exceeds the minimum price, let them pay more. I give you an example. In 1983 a minimum support price was fixed in Pondicherry. But till date they have not announced the amount. The farmers have started sm. agitation. Till now they say the Central Government has reduced, the State Government has announced according *to* the policy given bv the Central Government and when they approach the Central Government they say you ake not entitled to. Therefore, I would request the honourable Minister that the amount which is given per quintal of sugareane should be equal to all the States for the recovery point of 8.5 per cent.

Secondly, the ratio between the public distribution system and the free sale has been changed. Forty-five per cent goes to public distribution system ond fifty-five per cent to free sale. That being the case, why are you raising the price of sugar by 15 paise, when you are reducing the quota for public distribution system? I want an answer from the Minister.

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA (Karnataka); Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir the minimum price fixed now is far below the price paid by the States. In fact, as you are aware, in Kanataka no factory pays less than Rs. 30 per quintal. In Haryana it is Rs. 35. There is agitation in Punjab for Rs. 35 petr quintal; similarly in Bihar and elsewhere. Then why this exercise of fixing at Rs. 20 per quintal and the Agricultural Prices Commission recommending it? It is better to leave it to the States to fix the cane price according to their capacity. They will call the 'representatives of cane growers and the managements and fix price according to the viability of each concern, a price which is in the interests of the farmers. I do not know who advises the Central Government to fix the so-called minimum price.

As regards increasing the ratio, of free sale sugalr I differ from my learned friendg who opposed it. I personally welcome it. I know in Karnataka some of the sugar mills are on the verge of being closed. If you give them a little more encouragement, then they will be able to pay the outstanding arrears of cane price, if open market sugar proportion is increased, at least they will get some more funds. In the place from where the honourable Vice-Chairman cornes, a cooperative mill 'is closed and the workers are thlrown out of jobs. In the factory at SankesHwar they pay

higher cane price than anywhere else in the country, Rs. 380 pet tonne. There are two other mills, in the State which are being closed. I, therefore, want the Minlister to have a thorougn examination of all these aspects and I call fob a definite policy statement instead of these slipshod statement giving small increases in the minimum price as if they have given a higher' cane price to the canegrower.

I welcome the increase in the ratio regarding free sale, though it causes hardship to the consumers, as I do not consider sugar as an essential commodity. I want that the industry also should survive; at the same time 1 want the farmers to get remunerative price. Therefore, I welcoma the increase in the proportion. But, as Mt. Narayanasamy said, having increased the proportion of free sale sugar there wag no need to increase the price of levy Sugar.

The levy sugar price is also not uniform throughout the country. There is discrimination. You pay very less for levy sugar in Katnataka and you pay more in some other States. Why this discrimination? In some of the Nor:hern States, the recovery is as low as 7.5.pet cent or so While in Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh recovery goes up to 12 per cent, in some areas. Actually, in Katnataka, the average recovery ie 10 per cent. There is something basically wrong with your sugar policy. Therefore, I would suggest that this matter should be discussed separately in the House and a meeting qf the petsons concerned with the industry and aiso the representatives of the farmers should be called separately from each State, after discussing with them, the Government should come out with a comprehensive policy statement. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA): Now, Mr. Vishwasrao Patil.

श्री विश्वासराव रामराव पाटिल (महाराष्ट्र) : यह जो नारायण सामी जी ने कहा मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूं कि सारे देश में चीनी का लेवी मूल्य एक जैसा रहना चाहिये क्योंकि और किसी सीरियल के बारे में ऐसा मूल्य तय नहीं करते । गन्ने के दामों में काफी डिफरेंस हो रहा है । कोआपरेटिव शूगर फैक्टरी जो प्राइस देता है कर्नाटक, मैसूर और आंध्र प्रदेश में वह कुछ और है और जो प्राइवेट फैक्टरी यू. पी. में देती हैं वह कुछ और है । उसमें फर्क इसलिए हो जाता है कि लेवी प्राइस अलग अलग रखी हुई है । लेवी प्राइस यू. पी. में 546 रुपए पर-क्विंटल है। In Maharashtra, it is Rs. 393|- pel quintal and there is a difference of Rs. 153|-. Differences are also there in Karnataka, Andhra end Maharashtra, इसलिए सारे देश में एक ही लेवी प्राइस रहनी चाहिए ।

दूसरे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि गन्ने का जो मूल्य तय किया जाता है उसमें कुछ गलतियां हैं क्योंकि गन्ने का प्राइस कमीशन फार एग्रीकल्चर कास्ट्स एंड प्राइस तय करती है और शूगर का प्राइस इंडस्ट्रियल कास्ट्स एंड प्राइस तय करती है। प्राइस में गन्ना बोरने के बाद, उपजाऊ होने के बाद जब पूर्ण हो जाता उस तक की प्राइस तय की जाती है और चीनी की प्राइस फैक्टरी में जो गन्ना जाता है और जहां शूगर बनती है उस तक तय की जाती है। इस बीच में गन्ने की कटाई और उसका ट्रांसपोर्ट है और दूसरे खेत से फैक्टरी तक लाने का तकरीबन खर्च 70 रुपए पर क्विंटल होता है। इसके बारे में प्राइस कमीशन ने कुछ नहीं सोचा और इसीलिए यह गलती हो जाती है। सच्चाई में इसकी प्राइस लगभग 300 से 400 गन्ने की पर-क्विंटल होती है। यानी पर क्विंटल 400 रुपये तय करना होगा। आपने इस वक्त कम तय की है। मैं चाहता हूं सारे देश में लेवी प्राइस एक जैसी ही रखी जाए। गन्ने की प्राइस तय करने में ट्रांसपोर्ट और कटाई की जो कीमत है वह भी एड करनी चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Now, Mr. Ramnarayan Goswami.

SHRI RAMNARAYAN GOSWAMI (West Bengal): No, I do not want to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA); You gave your name and you insisted also, When I said that I would call one person, you said that I would call every person. All right. Now, Mr, Minister.

श्री सुख राम : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अभी जो मैंने शुगर पालिसी पर स्टेटमेंट दिया है उसके बारे में माननीय सदस्यों ने कुछ शंकाएं जाहिर की हैं और कुछ स्पष्टीकरण चाहा है। इसके पहले कि मैं उस पर अपना स्पष्टीकरण दूं, मैं माननीय सदस्यों के ध्यान में एक बात लाना चाहता हूं। इस देश की, खासतौर से, इस सरकार की नीति है कि हम चीनी के उत्पादन में आत्मनिर्भर हों और विदेशों से हम चीनी न मंगवायें जिससे हमारा जो फारेन एक्सचेंज है उसको न खर्च करें और जो हमारी शुगर पालिसी है वह कहां तक सही है और कहां तक गलत है, इस बात से उसका मूल्यांकन भी होता है। पिछले वर्ष यानी 1987-88 में हमने बाहर से कोई चीनी का आयात नहीं किया जब कि प्रति वर्ष हम चीनी का आयात करते थे। इस वर्ष जो शुगर ईयर बीता, उसमें 91.03 लाख का उत्पादन हुआ जो कि रिकार्ड उत्पादन था, सबसे ज्यादा उत्पादन था और हमारी जो खपत हुई है वह 93 लाख की हुई है।

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI (Andhra Pradesh): Sir,....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); No interruption now. You have already spoken. *(Interruptions)* I am not allowing you *(Interruptions)** I am not allowing anybody. No *interruption* will go on record. (Interruptions)*

Even this will not go on record.

*Not recorded.

श्री सुख राम : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे अफसोस इस बात का है कि माननीय विपक्ष के सदस्यों को इस बात पर एतराज है कि मैंने जो यह बात कही कि हमें आत्मनिर्भर होना है और यही हमारी नीति हैं, इस पर उनको एतराज है। अफसोस इस बात का है कि ऐसी बात पर उनको एतराज है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह सरकार की बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि है कि हम आत्मनिर्भर हुए हैं और इसके साथ-साथ हमने विदेशों को करीब 30 हजार टन चीनी का निर्यात भी किया है। हमारी कोशिश है कि अगले वर्ष यानी जो शूगर ईयर शूरू होने वाला है, हम करीब 96 लाख टन चीनी देश में पैदा करने वाले हैं। इस तरह से हमारी जो बढ़ोत्तरी है, इससे आगे हम एक्सपोर्ट करें और फोरेन एक्सचेंज कमायें तो मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार की यह सबसे बड़ी उपलब्धि होगी। हम आत्मनिर्भर हुए और अपनी आवश्यकता को पूरा कर सके, यह बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस पर शंका जाहिर की है कि हमने जो एस० एम० प्राइस 19.50 रुपये की है उसे ज्यादा होना चाहिए और कुछ सदस्यों ने इस संबंध में मांग की थी । मैं यह कहना इसमें स्टेट्यूटरी चाहता हूं कि मिनिमम प्राइस जो होता है वह तो भारत सरकार फिक्स करती है और उस कीमत से नीचे कोई भी गन्ना मालिक कीमत नहीं दे सकता है और दूसरी कीमत जो है वह हर प्रांतीय सरकार जो स्टेट एडवाइस प्राइस होता है वह हर प्रांतीय सरकार अपने हिसाब से तय करती है जैसे उत्तर प्रदेश में यह करीब 26 रु. क्विंटल था, जनरल वेराइटी का था उसको 30 रु. क्विंटल कर दिया गया है। सुखरोज वैरायटी का 34 रुपया कर दिया गया है। इसी तरह से जो पहले 32 था उसको 34 कर दिया गया था। इसी तरह से बाकी प्रांतीय सरकारों ने भी कीमतें उसकी बढ़ाई हैं। हमें एक बात का ख्याल रखना है कि हमको आत्मनिर्भर रहना है। हमको, तीन वर्ग जो है, एक तो गन्ना पैदा करने वालों

का वर्ग है, हम चाहते हैं कि उनको भी ठीक कीमत मिलनी चाहिए और जो प्रोसेस करने वाले हैं, चीनी बनाने वाले हैं, वे मिल चाहें कोआपरेटिव सेक्टर में हों प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हो या पब्लिक सेक्टर में हो, उनको भी सिक नहीं होना चाहिए। उनको भी इतनी मुनासिब रिटर्न आनी चाहिए . . . **(व्यवधान)** . . .

कुमारी सईदा खातून (मध्य प्रदेश) : मैं यह जानना चाहूंगी कि क्योंकि गन्ने के भाव अभी बढ़ाये गये हैं, इससे चीनी के भाव आटोमेटिक बढ़ेंगे ही। हम यह चाहते हैं कि ये भाव न बढ़ाते हुए उसकी प्रोडक्शन कास्ट जो आती है उसको किसी न किसी तरह से कम किया जाए। जैसे कि गन्ने के उत्पादन के लिए उनको जो फैसिलिटीज दी जाती है बिजली की, पानी की, खाद की उनका रेट कम करके उसकी प्रोडक्शन लागत को कम किया जाए। नहीं तो जिस तरह से आप इसका दाम बढ़ाते जायेंगे चीनी के दाम भी वैसे वैसे बढ़ते जायेंगे।

श्री सुखराम : यह बात भी हमारे ध्यान में है। माडर्नाइजेशन की बात है। इसीलिए तो हमने अभी शुगर पालिसी में परिवर्तन किया है। 2,500 टी०सी०सी० हमने रखी है इस वास्ते ताकि जितनी भी फैसिलिटी को मिल लगायें उसकी कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन में कमी हो। बहुत से ऐसे कदम उठाये गये हैं। मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि इसमें जो स्टेट एडवाइस प्राईस है, इसमें प्रान्तीय सरकारों को खुली छूट है कि कितनी वे कीमत निर्धारित करें। मगर इसके साथ साथ यह बात ठीक है कि जितनी आप कीमत गन्ने की बढ़ायेंगे उतनी ही आपकी जो ओपन मार्केट में चीनी बिकेगी वह और जो लेवी में हम चीनी देते हैं उसकी कीमत भी उसी के मुताबिक बढ़ेगी। अगर शुगर फैक्टरीज सारी सिक हो जाती हैं तो तब भी हम अपने मकसद में कामयाब नहीं हो सकते। इस वास्ते हमने तीनों बातों, गन्ना उत्पादकों, शुगर पैदा करने वालों और जो उपभोक्ता हैं उनको भी ठीक दाम पर चीनी मिले, को ध्यान में रखा है। अब यह कहा गया कि इसमें बहुत वृद्धि हुई। बावजूद इसके कि पिछले साल सूखा पड़ा और इसकी वजह से जो रिकवरी थी वह कम हुई और अभी क्योंकि कीमतें स्टेटवाइस प्राइस की दे रहे हैं और यह जो एस.एम.पी. का उसमें जो कैलकुलेशन होता है, सी.ए.सी.पी. का, वह एक एक्सपर्ट बाडी है और वह इसको तय करती है कि किसान के पैदावार की क्या लागत है, वह अगर दूसरे तरीके से कोआपरेट करता है तो उससे उसको कितना लाभ होगा, इस तरह की बातों को ध्यान में रखकर वह तय की जाती है। हमने इस वास्ते इसको बढ़ाया ताकि कृषकों को भी और उपभोक्ताओं को भी उचित मूल्य पर चीनी मिल सके। अभी यह कहा गया कि जो रेशियो है उसको बदल दिया गया है, यह तो सरेंडर है, मिल मालिकों के हक में सरेंडर है। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह किसी तरह से सरेंडर है। क्योंकि हमने जो यह 40 का रेट रखा है और 55 तो फ्री सेल का रखा है वह इस वास्ते किया है क्योंकि इसका उत्पादन अब जो है वह काफी है। हमारा जो 1-10-86 का आधार है 425 ग्राम प्रति व्यक्ति हम लेवी की शुगर देते हैं तो इस आधार पर हमारी कुल आवश्यकता 47 लाख टन है और इसके के लिए जो हमारे पास चीनी उपलब्ध है वह इतनी है कि हमको इस रेशियो को बदलने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। हम लोगों को चीनी इस दाम पर दे सकते हैं और जितनी सारे देश की लेवी की चीनी की आवश्यकता है उसकी भी पूरा कर सकते हैं। इसके साथ ही साथ फ्री सेल में भी बढ़ोत्तरी हुई है। इसमें कोई सरेंडर की बात नहीं है। एक बात यह भी कही गई कि सब जगह एक जैसे दाम होने चाहिए। अगर सारी प्रान्तीय सरकारें एक तरह की कीमतें फिक्स करें यह तभी

9.00 P.M. मुमकिन हो सकता है जहां तक लेवी और नान-लेवी चीनी का ताल्लुक है वह थोड़ी उतनी बढ़ी है क्योंकि अगर हम एस.एम.पी. को ज्यादा बढ़ाते हैं तो उसी के मुताबिक लेवी प्राइस भी बढ़ाना पड़ता है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता हूं कि जो सरकार की नीति है उसकी सफलता इसी से आंकी जा सकती है कि हमने

[श्री सुखराम]

बहुत प्रगति इस क्षेत्र में की है और तीनों वर्गों के लिए हमने ध्यान रखा है । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समझता हूं कि इस नीति का समर्थन यह माननीय सदन करेगा । धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Now the House stands adiourned and will mee again at 11.00 A.M. tomorrow, the 20th December, 1988.

The House then adjournec at one minute past nine of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 20th December, 1988.